

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 6-28 are currently pending in this application.

In the November 11, 2006 Office Action (OA), claims 1-3, 6, 8-9 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groves et al. (US2002/0158711). Claims 4-5, 7-15, 18-20 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves et al. Claims 21-22 and 25-28 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Additional art was cited of interest.

In accordance with the present response, independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to further patentably distinguish from the prior art of record. Applicants request reconsideration of their application in light of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 3-5, which have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections of claims 3-5, now the subject matter of independent claim 1, based on Groves et al.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a current source coupled in series with the secondary conductor and the switch. The OA asserts that Groves et al. teach this feature because the reference inherently discloses a current source coupled to the secondary conductor. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Groves et al. is directed to a circuit comprised of a switched inductor having primary and secondary spiral conductors. As recognized in the OA, Groves et al. do not explicitly disclose a current source coupled to the secondary conductor. Nevertheless, while a current may flow through the circuit in Groves et al., there is no teaching in Groves et al. of the specific structural arrangement between the current source and the secondary conductor and the switch, as recited in amended independent claim 1. More specifically, Groves et al. does not disclose or suggest a current source coupled in series with the secondary conductor and the switch, as recited in amended independent claim 1. This specific structural arrangement between the current source and the secondary conductor and the switch is not present in Groves et al., and one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize such structural feature to be present.

Moreover, amended independent claim 1 further recites that the current source is operable to control a current in the secondary conductor to flow in a first direction in the secondary conductor to reduce the inductance of the inductor and in a second direction in the secondary conductor to increase the inductance. No corresponding feature is disclosed or suggested by the prior art for record. For example, Groves et al. is concerned with decreasing the magnetic field of an inductor by the presence of one or more single loop windings positioned in proximity to the inductor. Groves et al. does not teach an increase or decrease in the inductance by a current source that controls the direction of the current through the secondary inductor, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Independent Claim 23

Amended independent claim 23 is directed to an integrated circuit and recites a primary conductor formed with traces on a circuit board, and a secondary conductor forming a loop with traces on the circuit board and in proximity to the primary conductor. No corresponding structural combination is disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-20 and 24 depend on and contain all of the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 23, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the prior art of record at least in the manner set forth above for amended claims 1 and 23.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that many of the dependent claims recite features that are clearly lacking from the applied reference and, therefore, do not acquiesce to any of the prior art rejections. For example, Groves et al. does not disclose or suggest a capacitor coupled in series with the secondary conductor and the switch, as recited in claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art rejections of claims 1, 2, 6-20, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C 102(b), 103(a) based on Groves et al. have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any

additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number **17-0026**. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/9/07

By: /George C. Pappas/
George C. Pappas
Reg. No. 35,065
Attorney for the Applicants

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-5797
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502